REMARKS

The Applicants and their Attorney of Record would like to thank Examiner Daniel Lastra for granting a telephone interview on September 29, 2004 to discuss the issues in this case. We are especially grateful to the Examiner for accommodating us at this is very busy time of year for him and the Patent Office.

As noted above, the Applicants **cancel** all previously pending claims numbered from 1 to 106. Applicants are filing a Request for Continued Examination and the accompanying Preliminary Amendment which presents **new** claims 107 and 108. Applicants reserve the right to file one or more continuation applications for the canceled claims.

The new claims recite the novel aspects of the present invention more clearly than the previous claims and contain elements that distinguish them from the previously asserted prior art references.

Claim 107 recites that the decision of what type of advertisement will be displayed on the client computer is *made on the client computer* and not on a server computer or any other external component in the network. Part of the decision or determination as to what type of advertisement will be displayed is made, in one aspect of the present invention, by the user selecting an "advertisement-determinative category" from a list of categories on the client computer. This user-selected ad category, which can be described as a user ad preference, is stored on the client computer and is used primarily by the client computer to construct an "advertisement descriptor/locator," for example a URL, which is then transmitted to a server computer. The server computer receives the descriptor/locator, makes any necessary technical

modifications or additions to it, retrieves the self-targeted ad, and transmits it to the client computer.

The new claims also recite in the preamble that the "self-targeted" ads are *pulled* to the client computer. They recite limitations that make clear that an advertisement transmitted to the client computer is a self-targeted advertisement rather than merely a "targeted" or pushed advertisement – a concept that is well established in the art. The concept of "pulling" general content or non-advertisement content to a client computer is one that has propelled growth of the Internet -- users pull content from the Internet to their web browsers all the time – and there is nothing novel about this concept.

However, the one type of content that is not pulled by users over the Internet is advertisements. This is true because advertisers have conventionally *pushed* or targeted ads to a user because they are attempting to sell something to the user that the user may not want, is not thinking about or, the user may be targeted by an advertiser based on a user profile. In contrast, the present claims recite the element of each user pulling ads that each user wants to the user's browser. Each user selects an advertisement-determinative category. This is a new model for advertising over the Internet. A user selects an advertisement-determinative category and, if desired, a sub-category. By doing so, each user effectively says to the Internet: "These are the types of ads I want to see," and thereby each user is able to pull those types of ads to his or her client computer.

Claim 108 recites limitations wherein data on the client, for example, a user's previous behavior, data from a web page, or data from a cookie, determines a specific advertisement to be displayed in the page. In this aspect of the present invention, the user does not select from a list

of advertisement-determinative categories and is not directly involved in the process of determining which advertisement will be viewed. As with claim 107, the specific advertisement is pulled to the client computer by generating an "advertisement locator/descriptor" *on the client computer* based on data stored on the client at the time the determination is made.

The Applicants assert that these new claims are clearly distinguishable from the two primary cited prior art references, namely, the Gupta patent ('538) and the Reilly patent ('549).

Favorable consideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Sept. 30, 2004

By: _____
Rupak Nag
Registration No. 37,493

2170 Century Park East
Suite 1210
Los Angeles, CA 90067
(310) 785-9660